REMARKS

This Amendment is filed as part of a Request for Continuing Examination. Claims 1-25 and 28-40 stand rejected. Claims 1-40 have been cancelled. New claims 41-69 have been added. The new claims are supported by the original specification and figures. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. Reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

New claim 1 recites:

> 41.   *A method of processing a gaming slip, comprising:*
> *reading a random request region corresponding to a single game from the gaming slip, the random request region having a player's written mark made with a writing instrument, the written mark indicating the player's request for a plurality of randomly generated picks in the single game; and*
> *responsive to reading the random request region, generating the requested plurality of randomly generated picks for the single game, each pick including a plurality of randomly-generated numbers, the quantity of picks generated for the single game being determined based on information read from the random request region.*

The previously cited Jarvis reference does not teach or suggest any marking region for *a single game* that allows the player to select *multiple* randomly generated picks *for that single game*. The previously cited Novak reference does not teach or suggest the selection of multiple random picks for a single game by using a written mark made with a writing instrument. In fact, Novak teaches away from manual playslips entirely, employing a special purpose terminal to generate playslips using pushbuttons. Accordingly, Novak does not remedy the deficiencies of Jarvis, and teaches away from a combination with Jarvis. For at least this reason, claim 41 should be allowable over the cited Novak and Jarvis references, as well as their proposed combination. Accordingly, new claim 41 should be allowable over the cited art of record.

Claims 42-53 depend from claim 41 and therefore should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 41.

Claim 54 recites:

> *54.   A gaming slip, comprising:*
> *a substrate; and*
> *gaming information coupled to the substrate, the gaming information including a random request region having a marking area corresponding to a single game, wherein the random request region corresponding to the single game is configured to enable a player to request a plurality of computer generated picks for the single game by writing in the marking area with a writing instrument.*

As discussed above with respect to claim 41, Jarvis does not teach or suggest a random request region corresponding to a single game which is configured to enable a player to request a plurality of computer generated picks for the single by writing in the marking area. The proposed addition of Novak does not correct this deficiency. Moreover, Novak teaches away from the proposed combination because Novak uses an automatic push button terminal to generate pick slips, rather than a system with manually completed play slips. Accordingly, new claim 54 should be allowable over the cited art of record.

Claims 55-69 depend from claim 1 and therefore should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 54.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/718,118
Amendment addressing Office Action of March 24, 2006

PATENT
12406/79

The Office is authorized to charge any fees associated with this Amendment to Kenyon & Kenyon LLP, Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully Submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: Aug. 7, 2007

By: _____

Andrew L. Reibman
(Reg. No. 47,893)

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646

1387705